



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,652	02/04/2005	Xuanming Shi	05501-PCT	5850
33804	7590	10/21/2008	EXAMINER	
LIN & ASSOCIATES INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, INC. P.O. BOX 2339 SARATOGA, CA 95070-0339			SCHWARTZ, DARREN B	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2435		
		NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		10/21/2008		ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jason.lin@linassociatesip.com
jasonlin@gmail.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/523,652	Applicant(s) SHI, XUANMING
	Examiner DARREN SCHWARTZ	Art Unit 2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 26 august 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1. In light of applicant's amendments, the rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, of claims 1-9 and 12-18 is withdrawn.
2. Applicant argues that Ferchichi does not teach "the ICP also provides an administration/drive module monitoring access of the user-login-identification means to set up a connection and hang up the connection of the user-login-identification means in the login web page."
3. The Examiner disagrees. Ferchichi teaches aside from the lines stated in the Office action dated 27 May 2008, the following: "The single sign-on module can be realized as a software module running on a microprocessor" (page 6, lines 6-7), "The user interface in order to prompt the user for his login name and secrets. This step may include displaying a dialog box on a graphical user interface on the display of the user equipment, voice prompt, etc" (page 6, lines 13-16).
4. In response to applicant's argument that the disclosure of Ferchichi is different from the recitation "the user-login identification means is provided with an ID number," a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural

difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

5. Applicant argues the login name and secrets disclosed by Ferchichi is the user's identification information, which is completely different from ICP access authentication information of the instant invention (page 12-13 of REMARKS).

6. Firstly, in response to applicant's argument, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

7. Secondly, one of ordinary skill in the art would easily recognize the "login name" and "secrets" of a "user's identification information" as "access authentication information."

8. Applicant argues that Ferchichi is silent to "the ICP requests to access the user-login-identification means."

9. The Examiner is unable to find this limitation in claim 1. Applicant is reminded that the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

10. The applicant reminds the applicant that while the user-login-identification means can be interpreted as the smart card of Ferchichi, various interpretations of a "user-login-identification means" are possible.
11. Applicant argues that "in Ferchichi, the ID and passwords is the ID and password of the user, which is not the identification number of the user-login-identification means."
12. The Examiner cannot find these limitations in claim 1. The applicant is reminded the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
13. Applicant believes the Examiner has made a miss-interpretation regarding the one-way hash function.
14. The Examiner will clarify the position originally stated and assures the applicant the Examiner has not incorrectly interpreted *transformation* for *transmission*.
15. Re claim 10: Applicant claims the user-login-identification means performs the information transmission by operating the computer. Ferchichi teaches, at least, the following: "Another known example is the so-called SecureID authentication process. In this case, the user 10 is provided with a token that display a new secret number each minute. At each authentication the user enters the new displayed number" (page 8, lines 8-12), "3.1.4 – Cryptographic authenticators" and "This category of cryptographic

Art Unit: 2135

authentication mechanism is illustrated in Figure 3. In this case, a one-way hash function 51 is used to transform the secret 50, together with some other data such as a replay attack protection, the user-ID, a sequence number or a random number, in an encrypted authenticator 52." As such the

16. The Examiner upholds the Ferchichi reference.

17. The fact that the Examiner may not have specifically responded to any particular arguments made by Applicant and Applicant's Representative, should not be construed as indicating Examiner's agreement therewith.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 3-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi et al. (WO 01/60013 A1), hereinafter referred to as Ferchichi, in view of Gupta et al. (U.S. Pat Pub 2001/0037469 A1), hereinafter referred to as Gupta.

Re claim 1: A method for centralizing administration of user registration information across networks (Abstract: lines 1-3), characterized by:

including at least an Internet Content Provider (ICP) [single sign-on module] and a user-login-identification means [Fig 13, elt 17: smart-card] which can access an online terminal [mobile phone/laptop] (Abstract: lines 1-3; page 6, lines 4-10);

wherein the ICP adds an interface module in a login web page (page 6, lines 11-14; page 17, lines 5-7) and accesses the user-login-identification means [smart-card] via the interface module (page 6, lines 19-22), and the ICP also provides an administration/drive module monitoring access of the user-login-identification means to set up a connection and hang up the connection for the user-login-identification means in the login web page (page 6, lines 19-26);

the user-login-identification means is provided with an ID number (page 8, lines 8-11; page 22, lines 19-21), and user's login identification information is stored in the user-login-identification means (page 6, lines 24-26; page 12, lines 15-16);

ICP access authentication information is stored in the user-login-identification means to verify whether the accessing ICP is authorized to access (page 6, lines 19-26);

if the accessing ICP passed the verification, its access is permitted, otherwise the access is not permitted (page 12, lines 4-14);

wherein the ICP is permitted to access the user-login-identification means only if the ICP is authenticated , when the user-login-identification means is activated (page 12, lines 15-27) (see also page 13, lines 3-12 and lines 16-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ferchichi reference to utilize a combination of

authentication schemes (i.e. a combination of Auth1,...,Auth9), as shown in figure 13, element 17, for the purpose of providing a more secure single-sign-on system while using a security token.

Gupta teaches authenticating comprises, obtaining an authentication file [cookie] via the interface module, transmitting the authentication file to the administration/drive module (¶35), decrypting the authentication file by the administration/drive module, and accessing the user-login-identification means (¶74, ¶86).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Ferchichi with the teachings of Gupta, to securely transmit an authentication file for the verifying authority for the purposes of validating the client and verifying document parameters associated with the client. One would have also have been motivated to securely transmit the file for the purposes of preventing man-in-the-middle attacks.

Re claim 3: The combination of Ferchichi and Gupta teaches the ICP accessing the user-login-identification means includes checking the user ID identification information stored in the user-login-identification means, or generating the user ID identification information in the user-login-identification means (Ferchichi: page 6, lines 24-27 and page 11, lines 19-22).

Re claim 4: The combination of Ferchichi and Gupta teaches the ICP reads the information stored in the user-login-identification means, and if login identification information is obtained, the interface module returns the login identification information to the ICP web page and determines whether a login-submit or an automatic submit &

login should be performed according to user's setup; if the login identification information is not obtained, the interface module informs the web page that the login identification information is not available and stores the generated login identification information in the user-login-identification means (Gupta: ¶73, ¶77).

Re claim 5: The combination of Ferchichi and Gupta teaches an ICP web page is provided with a registration information window (Gupta: ¶73); the ICP invokes parameters of the interface module and simultaneously saves several sets of registration information of a same web page or saves the last set of registration information in the user-login-identification means (Gupta: ¶74, lines 16-28; ¶78, lines 14-21), and the registration information can also be displayed on the ICP web page (Gupta: ¶36, lines 14-16)

Re claim 6: The combination of Ferchichi and Gupta teaches an ICP web page is provided with a registration information window (Gupta: ¶73); the ICP accesses the user-login-identification means via the interface module (page 6, lines 19-22) and verifies the login identification information provided by the ICP web page (Ferchichi: Fig 3, elts 302, 304 & 316; ¶79 and ¶81), and stores new login identification information in the user-login-identification means to overwrite original login identification information (Ferchichi: page 45, claim 39 teaches replacing a secret on the smart-card), and transfers relating information to the ICP web page (Gupta: ¶77); the information is displayed on the web page after being obtained (Gupta: ¶77).

Re claim 7: The combination of Ferchichi and Gupta teaches the ICP web page is provided with a plurality of window links of the registration information (Gupta: ¶73);

the ICP reads the user-login-identification information stored in the user-login-identification means and verifies the login identification information provided by the ICP web page; if positive, the login identification information is directly read out and the relating information is transferred to the ICP web page (Gupta: ¶¶73, ¶¶77); the information is displayed on the web page after being obtained (Gupta: ¶¶77). if verification appears negative, the login identification information is stored in the user-login-identification means (Ferchichi and Gupta teach that if credentials provided by a combination of the user or the smart-card are invalid, access is denied; ergo, the user-login-identification means is unaltered.)

Re claim 8: The combination of Ferchichi and Gupta further teaches a login verification serving party for implementing prior authentication to the ICP and obtaining guide information of the user-login-identification means (Gupta: Fig 3, elt 304; prior to authorizing the client session, see steps 310 and 316 of Fig 3, elt 304, a prior authentication method, is preformed).

Re claim 9: The combination of Ferchichi and Gupta further teaches the ICP is connected with a login verification serving party [Gupta: Fig 2, elt 204] which transmits a code for accessing the user-login-identification means to the ICP, and the ICP adds the login identification information in the login web page according to the code, and the interface module transmits the ICP information to the login verification serving party for verification; if the ICP information passed the verification, the ICP is permitted to access the user-login-identification means, wherein the user activates the user-login-identification means by using a password, and then the ICP accesses the login

Art Unit: 2135

verification serving party for an authentication via the interface module; if the authentication is valid, the ICP can operate the user-login-identification means via the interface module and the actuating password used by the user is provided by the login verification serving party or preset in the means (Ferchichi: page 6, lines 11-26 and Gupta: ¶73, ¶77); the encryption files of the ICPs transmitted by the login verification serving party are different from each other (Ferchichi: page 8, lines 20-24 and Gupta: ¶86).

3. Claims 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi et al. (WO 01/60013 A1), hereinafter referred to as Ferchichi and Gupta et al. (U.S. Pat Pub 2001/0037469 A1), hereinafter referred to as Gupta, as applied to claim 1, in further view of Wu, Wei-Je (TW 480435), hereinafter referred to as Wu.

Re claim 2: The combination of Ferchichi and Gupta teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as previously discussed and further teach the administration/drive module is used to automatically log in, in the case that the ICP accesses the user-login-identification means via the interface module and verifies the identification information.

However, Wu teaches the administration/drive module is used to lead in and/or lead out data stored in the user-login-identification means so as to backup the data (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of Ferchichi and Gupta with the teachings of Wu for the purpose of securing content stored on an original smart in the event that it is lost, damaged or becomes inaccessible to the user.

4. Claims 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi et al. (WO 01/60013 A1), hereinafter referred to as Ferchichi, in view of Wu, Wei-Je (TW 480435), hereinafter referred to as Wu.

Re claim 10: Ferchichi teaches a system for realizing the method for centralizing administration of user registration information across networks (page 1, lines 1-5), comprising a computer [Fig 1, elt 10: user; Fig 15, elts 207 & 209: mobile users], Internet networks [page 6, lines 1—13; page 19, line 15], at least an ICP [Fig 1, elt 13: single sign-on module] and a user-login-identification means [Fig 1, elt 17: smart-card], wherein the computer is used for logging in the Internet networks to communicate with different ICPs (Fig 13, elts 162-169: authentication servers; page 16, lines 15-24); the user-login-identification means is for accessing the computer from outside (page 6, lines 19-22) and has at least an identification number (page 8, lines 8-11; page 22, lines 19-21) the user-login-identification means performs the information transmission by operating the computer (page 8, lines 20-24).

However, Wu teaches the user-login-identification means is capable of encryption storage space (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Ferchichi reference user-login-identification means to incorporate an encrypted storage space, as taught by Wu, for the purpose of securing secret data on the card without revealing the content to the holder of the user-login-identification means.

5. Claims 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi et al. (WO 01/60013 A1), hereinafter referred to as Ferchichi and Wu, Wei-Je (TW 480435), hereinafter referred to as Wu, as applied to claim 10, in further view of Gupta et al. (U.S. Pat Pub 2001/0037469 A1), hereinafter referred to as Gupta.

Re claim 11: Ferchichi in view of Wu teach all the limitations of claim 10 as previously stated.

However, Gupta teaches the ICP is connected with a login verification serving party [Fig 2, elt 204] which transmits a code for accessing the user-login-identification means to the ICP, and the ICP adds the login identification information in a login web page according to the code, and an interface module transmits ICP information to the login verification serving party for verification (¶73, ¶77); if the verification is valid, the ICP is permitted to access the user-login-identification means, and the login verification serving party is a server (¶73, ¶77; Fig 2, elt 204).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teachings of the Ferchichi and Wu references with the teachings of the Gupta reference for the purpose of providing a remote sso authentication means via a smart-card using a web-page applet.

Re claim 12: The combination of Ferchichi, Wu and Gupta teaches information transmission between the computer and the user-login-identification means is processed with encryption or decryption (Ferchichi: Table on pages 14-15); the encryption includes protecting an encryption area by using the user's PIN code or

utilizing RSA 512PKI key management encryption method (Ferchichi: Table on pages 14-15).

Re claim 13: The combination of Ferchichi, Wu and Gupta teaches the user-login-identification means is also provided with a storage region for storing the information of the ICP itself (Ferchichi: page 3, lines 1-2).

Re claim 14: The combination of Ferchichi, Wu and Gupta teaches the user-login-identification means is an external and portable memory means with a standard data interface, or a card-reader means or an ID identifying means thereof (Ferchichi: (page 8, lines 8-11; page 11, lines 23-26; page 22, lines 19-21).

Re claim 15: The combination of Ferchichi, Wu and Gupta teaches the user-login-identification means is a USB storage device, a CF card, a MMC card, a SD card, a SMC card, an IBM Micro Drive card, a flash storage module or an IC card (Ferchichi: Abstract; page 1, lines 1-2).

Re claim 16: The combination of Ferchichi, Wu and Gupta teaches the portable memory card-reader means is a CF card processor, a MMC card processor, a SD card processor, a SMC card processor, an IBM Micro Drive card processor or an IC card processor (Ferchichi: page 19, lines 6-14; page 33, lines 9-12).

Re claim 17: The combination of Ferchichi, Wu and Gupta teaches the user-login-identification means is a computer peripheral (Ferchichi: Abstract: lines 1-3; page 19, lines 6-14).

Re claim 18: The combination of Ferchichi, Wu and Gupta teaches the user-login-identification means is a portable PDA, a music player or an electrical dictionary (Ferchichi: Abstract: lines 1-3; page 19, lines 6-14).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DARREN SCHWARTZ whose telephone number is (571)270-3850. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571)272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2135

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. S./

Examiner, Art Unit 2135

/KimYen Vu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435